		1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2	X	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, :	15-CR-517(WFK)
4		
5 6	-against-	United States Courthouse
7		Brooklyn, New York
	ALT CALFIL	November 17, 2021
8	ALI SALEH, :	12:00 p.m.
9	Defendant. :	
10	X	
11	TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL	
12 13	BEFORE THE HONORABLE W UNITED STATES DISTR	
13	APPEARANCES:	
15		
16		ed States Attorney trict of New York
17	271 C	adman Plaza East lyn, New York 11201
18	BY: SARIT	HA KOMATIREDDY NDER MINDLIN
19	DOUG	PRAVDA tant United States Attorneys
20		NY RICCO, ESQ.
21	BY: MICHA	EL BACHRACH, ESQ. ZISSOU, ESQ.
22	Court Reporter: Michele D. Lucc	, in the second
23	Official Court (718) 613-2272	
24	E-mail: MLucche	seENDY@gmail.com
25	Proceedings recorded by computer	ized stenography. Transcript
	produced by Computer-aided Trans	

24

25

THE COURT:

2 Proceedings THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: United States District Court 1 2 for the Eastern District is now open for the transaction of 3 all business which may come before it. The Honorable William 4 F. Kuntz, II presiding. Criminal cause for a sentencing 15-CR-517, USA 5 versus Ali Saleh. 6 7 Counsel, please state your appearances for the 8 record, starting with the Government. 9 MS. KOMATIREDDY: Good morning, Your Honor. Saritha 10 Komatirredy for the United States. I'm joined by my 11 co-counsel AUSA Alexander Mindlin, also seated at the table is 12 counsel for the parallel matter, AUSA Doug Pravda. 13 Behind us are case agents, Special Agents Brent 14 Newman and William Slattery of the FBI. 15 THE COURT: Good afternoon. Sit down. MR. RICCO: Good morning, Your Honor. Anthony 16 17 Ricco. Last name R-I-C-C-O. One of the three lawyers for Mr. 18 Ali Saleh. Good afternoon. 19 MR. BACHRACH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Michael Bachrach also for Ali Saleh. 20 21 MR. ZISSOU: Also appearing, Steve Zissou, 22 Z-I-S-S-0-U. Good to see you again, Your Honor.

Michele Lucchese, RPA, CRR Officia, Court Reporter

The Court will now proceed in separate and

successive proceedings as required by Part 3D of the

Defendant is present. Sit down.

3 Proceedings sentencing guidelines to prevent multiple punishments for 1 2 substantially identical conduct. 3 This Court will now sentence the defendant, Ali 4 Saleh, in Docket Number 15-CR-517. 5 The defendant pled guilty to attempting to provide material support to a foreign terrorist organization in 6 7 violation of Title 18, U.S.C., Section 2339B(a)(1). 8 One sentence is pronounced in this case, this Court 9 will then adjourn this proceeding immediately to proceed to 10 sentencing the defendant in case docket 18-CR-468. 11 Counsel for the Government, are you ready to 12 proceed? 13 MS. KOMATIREDDY: Yes, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Defense counsel, are you ready to proceed? 15 16 MR. RICCO: Yes, sir. 17 THE COURT: Probation, are you ready to proceed? 18 THE PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor. 19 Mr. Saleh, you and your counsel have had THE COURT: 20 ample opportunity to review carefully and to discuss your 21 revised pre-sentence investigation report filed on December 22 17th of 2019, its first addendum filed on November 4 of 2021 23 and its second addendum filed on November 15 of 2021. 24 You and your counsel have also had an opportunity 25 review carefully and have, in fact, reviewed carefully the

Proceedings 4 The Complaint filed on September 16, 1 following documents: 2 2015, the superseding indictment filed on February 11, 2016, the plea agreement dated July 24, 2018, defense counsel's 3 4 sentencing memorandum and attached exhibits filed on November 5 12 of 2021, the Government's sentencing memorandum filed on 6 October 22nd of 2021. 7 Are there any additional documents that either 8 counsel wishes to call to the Court's particular attention at 9 this time? From the Government? 10 MS. KOMATIREDDY: No. Your Honor. Thank you. THE COURT: Probation? 11 12 THE PROBATION OFFICER: No, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Defense counsel? 14 MR. RICCO: No, sir. 15 Mr. Saleh, you have the right to address THE COURT: 16 this Court before I impose sentence. I will give you the 17 opportunity to do so in a few minutes, and at that time, say 18 anything you think appropriate before I finalize my judgment 19 in this case. 20 If you are not satisfied with your counsel's 21 representations and/or if you believe you have not received 22 the effective assistance of counsel, you may raise a claim of 23 ineffective assistance of counsel at an appropriate time and 24 in an appropriate forum.

On July 24, 2018, the defendant pled guilty to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sexual violence.

Proceedings

Counts Two and Three of the superseding indictment charging the defendant with attempting to provide material support to a foreign terrorist organization, specifically, the defendant swore an oath of allegiance to ISIS, one of the preeminent terrorist threats to the United States of America in the world today, responsible for more deaths than any other terrorist or extremist group over the past several years. At the time of the defendant's offense, ISIS was pursuing the objective of establishing an Islamic State, or caliphate, based in the Middle East. At the time of the defendant's offense, ISIS routinely carried out killings, murders, and deliberate targeting of civilians, mass executions, persecutions of individuals of communities on the basis of their religion, nationality, or ethnicity, kidnaping of civilians; forced displacement of Shia Muslim communities and minorities;

Using social media, this defendant professed his support for the terrorist organizations and assisted their recruitment efforts. Defendant made multiple attempts from multiple cities to fly to Syria to join and to fight for ISIS. American law enforcement prevented him from achieving his goals.

killing and maiming of children, rape, and other forms of

This defendant has been in pretrial detention at the Metropolitan Detention Center since September of 2015.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

6

detailed in the pre-sentence investigation report and its addenda, this defendant has been cited on at least 100 separate occasions for committing disciplinary infractions, many of which involved acts of violence on his part.

Among other items, this defendant has repeatedly been cited for refusing to obey orders; covering his cell window unit: hitting the distress alarm button when no emergency existed; refusing to attend disciplinary hearings, refusing to stand for prison counts; being found in unauthorized spaces during lockdowns: possessing dangerous weapons, interfering with security devices; breaking handcuffs, light fixtures, food slots, and other furniture in his cell; fighting with other inmates; and violently assaulting various Bureau of Prisons officials.

Most notably, this defendant violently assaulted a federal officer at the MDC on July 13, 2018. The defendant attacked the officer with a knife. The assault resulted in a new prosecution, to which the defendant pled guilty, and for which he will be separately sentenced in the proceeding immediately following this one.

The United States Code sets the following sentencing parameters for a violation of Count Two of the superseding indictment, attempt to provide material support to a foreign terrorist organization: A statutory maximum imprisonment term of 15 years, a statutory maximum supervised release term of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

7

life, a fine of up to \$250,000, and a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

The United States Code sets the following sentencing parameters for a violation of Count Three of the superseding indictment, attempt to provide material support to a foreign terrorist organization: A statutory maximum imprisonment term of 20 years, a statutory maximum supervised release term of life, a fine of up to \$250,000 and a mandatory special assessment of \$100 per count.

The sentences imposed on these counts may run consecutively.

This Court must also consider the sentencing parameters set by the United States Sentencing Guidelines. The applicable guidelines for violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 2339B(a)(1) is USSG Section 2M5.3(A), which all parties agree provides a base offense level of 26.

The parties also agree that because the defendant transported 1,196 grams of explosive powder in a concealed compartment inside the trunk of his car during the instant offense, two levels are added pursuant to USSG --

> THE defendant: That's not true.

THE COURT: --2M5.3(b)(1)(C).

The parties also agree that because the offense is a felony that involved or was intended to promote a federal crime of terrorism, the offense level is increased by 12

levels.

Furthermore, the Government and defense counsel agree that the defendant's timely acceptance of his responsibility pursuant to USSG Sections 3E1.1(a) through (b) results in a three-level reduction. Probation does not credit the defendant with this reduction because Probation groups the offenses in dockets 15-CR-517 and 18-CR-468. Therefore, the defendant's total offense level according to the Government and defense counsel is 37. Defendant's total offense level according to Probation is 40.

The parties agree the defendant has a Criminal History Category of six. Defendant has no known prior criminal conviction and his criminal history score is zero, which normally establishes a criminal history category of one. However, because the instant offense is a felony that involved, or was intended to promote, a federal crime of terrorism, defendant's Criminal History Category is a category six.

A total offense level of 37 or 40, with a Criminal History Category of six, yields a guidelines imprisonment range of 360 months to life. However, because of the statutory maximum sentence, the effective Guidelines range is 360 months to 420 months of imprisonment.

In addition, the guidelines further suggest a term of supervised release of one year to life, a fine of between

9 Proceedings 50,000 and \$500,000, and the defendant is ineligible for 1 2 Probation. 3 United States Probation Department recommends a 4 sentence of 15 years in custody on Count Two and 20 years of 5 custody on Count Three to run consecutively, 15 years of supervised release to run consecutively on each count, and the 6 7 special conditions outlined in their sentencing 8 recommendation. 9 The Government recommends a guidelines sentence of between 360 and 420 months and notes that the defendant also 10 11 consented to a life term of supervised release in the plea 12 agreement. 13 Defense counsel does not ask the Court for a 14 specific sentence in this case, but instead asks for a 15 sentence of not more than 300 months on both this indictment 16 and the indictment charged in Docket Number 18-CR-468, which is also pending before this Court. 17 18 Counsel, am I missing anything pertinent to today's 19 proceeding from the Government? 20 MS. KOMATIREDDY: Not from the Government, Your 21 Honor. 22 THE COURT: Defense counsel? 23 MR. RICCO: No. sir. 24 THE COURT: Probation?

No, Your Honor.

THE PROBATION OFFICER:

	Proceedings 10
1	THE COURT: Are there any other objections that
2	either counsel wishes to raise other than those that have been
3	submitted in writing to the Court?
4	From the Government?
5	MS. KOMATIREDDY: No, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Probation?
7	THE PROBATION OFFICER: No, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Defense counsel?
9	MR. RICCO: No, sir.
10	THE COURT: That being the case, I will now turn it
11	over to the defense.
12	MR. RICCO: Good morning, Your Honor.
13	The first thing I'd like to do, Your Honor, is note
14	present in court today is the family of Ali Saleh. I would
15	also like to note that his mother and father are present,
16	along with other relatives, and that they have been here on
17	virtually every appearance in connection with this case that
18	has gone on now more than six years. It's more than one case,
19	but over the course of the cases.
20	As Your Honor is aware, I was not the initial
21	counsel in this case. I think I came into this case maybe
22	about two years after Mr. Saleh was in custody and proceedings
23	had took place before Your Honor.
24	During the time period that I have represented Mr.
25	Saleh, we had many discussions about the case, about his life

Proceedings

before he was arrested on the original charges, and about some plans that he had for a future for himself. Those conversations led us to a point where Mr. Saleh was prepared and did take acceptance of responsibility for his conduct in connection with this case.

Judge, long before I got involved in this case, Mr. Saleh had been in the SHU for years. Every visit that I have had with Mr. Saleh has been in the SHU. Every visit with Mr. Saleh in the SHU has been cordial, pleasant, respectful and without incident.

After Mr. Saleh -- just before Mr. Saleh entered a plea in this case, of course we had the conduct that related in the second indictment, the conduct was captured on videotape, very serious conduct that Your Honor has alluded to. Notwithstanding that conduct, Mr. Saleh came into court on the 24th of July and entered a plea, took acceptance of responsibility for his conduct.

Over the years, Your Honor, I have had the opportunity to appear in this courthouse and in courthouses across our country with individuals who are charged with serious crimes of this nature, including the bombing of the World Trade Center, the conspiracy to blow up the World Trade Center.

Under the Criminal Justice Act, I have represented individuals on death row, individuals who have been involved

Michele Lucchese, RPK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

Proceedings

in serious and profound criminal conduct, and I have had the opportunity to visit with inmates who have served for decades in isolation on Range 13 at ADMAX and I have seen the effects of long-term incarceration and isolation on human beings that take place over decades of being isolated in penitentiaries.

My own observations are consistent with the findings of the U.N. when the U.N. adopted what is known as the Nelson Mandela rules which defines segregated conduct of more than 15 days is torture.

The State of New York, in 2011, passed into law an act called the Human Alternatives to Long-Term Solitary Confinement Act known as the HALT Solitary Confinement Act, and under that act defendants are not allowed to be kept in segregated housing for more than 15 consecutive days.

Those legislative findings by New York State, which are far ahead of our Federal Government on this issue, and the United Nations, which is far ahead of both New York State and the Federal Government on this issue, findings are based on studies done by the World Health Organization, scholars, psychologists, who have interviewed thousands of men and women who have served in solitary confinement. And what the experts and scholars have said mirrors my own experience as a professional that individuals who are in these circumstances for more than 15 days consecutive begin to hallucinate, they begin to have anxiety attacks, they begin to suffer from panic

attacks, they suffer from deep paranoia, which results in a loss of control and impulsive conduct.

The defendant in this case has been in the Special Housing Unit, by my estimation, more than 2,190 days. The concerns about the state of mind of a human being who is in solitary confinement for more than 15 days dwarfs the experiences of the defendant that is before the Court for sentencing for his very serious conduct. These remarks are not made, Your Honor, as an excuse for Mr. Saleh's conduct, both the underlying conduct, but certainly his conduct in the Bureau of Prisons.

The Bureau of Prisons cannot function unless the inmates have respect for and follow the rules. And when they don't, there has to be some type of consequence. What that is, Your Honor, I'm not qualified to say. Nor am I qualified, Your Honor, to speak on the psychological impact of long-term incarceration in the special housing unit. That's not my area of expertise. But those who are qualified talk about the dangers to the human mind as a result of it.

I have looked closely, Your Honor, at the disciplinary record here, and it is as woeful as Your Honor has pointed out, and I think Your Honor might have missed one or two. Everything is here. There are hundreds of infractions dating back to 2015.

I think -- Mr. Bachrach, who is always on top of

these things, reminds me that within two weeks of Mr. Saleh being at the MDC, he was at the Special Housing Unit and he has remained there pretty much since that time.

His first serious infractions involving assaults and fighting take place in April of 2016, when he was there about nine months. Before that time, you have the type of violations that I think would not raise deep concerns, but would raise concerns: The failure to obey orders, failure to stand, disobeying, letting other inmates use his phone, PIN number, things of that nature. After about nine months in solitary confinement, we do begin to see the type of conduct that is alarming.

Although the defendant's conduct over that time period deteriorated, it never stopped myself or Michael Bachrach or Steve Zissou from returning to the Court to try to find the soul of a young man who is before the Court on quite serious charges so that we could help him resolve these cases, to accept responsibility for his conduct, and be in a position where we can say something to the Court about him other than what is set forth in the records, the BOP records and his behavior in connection with the underlying offense.

So, Judge, that really comes down to this: Before his involvement and recruitment by ISIS, he was a member of a loving family that you see in the courtroom today. His father is a hard-working man who came to this country and took full

Michele Lucchese, RPK, CRR Officia. Cour. Reporter

advantage of the opportunities that are available.

Ali Saleh is loved by his family, who are a family of law-abiding people, who have no contact whatsoever with criminal justice at all.

Before his involvement here, we are told by his family that Ali Saleh was a very quiet young man, spent most of his time to himself, did not have a lot of friends, but was always pleasant and amicable with people. The parents feel like they lost their son to the influence of other people and they're heartbroken, as any parents would be, Your Honor, because they recognize that Mr. Saleh has to be held accountable for his conduct and they recognize that and they respect that. They have very strong religious beliefs. They have faith in God. They have faith in who they are as parents and I know that they will continue to provide that type of support for him.

Mr. Saleh may not like for me to say it, but at his core, he is a young man. He is a young man who went astray. He is a young man like many young men in this country who have had their actions influenced by folks who are far more powerful than them who seek out individuals to recruit for their efforts.

Mr. Saleh has a very serious price to pay here, Your Honor. There are a lot of people who would describe him as difficult. I don't. Complicated, yes. Afraid, yes.

Michele Lucchese, RPK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

Courageous, yes.

I would say that both Mr. Bachrach and Mr. Zissou have certainly appreciated the fact that Your Honor has allowed us to stay on the case and to work with Mr. Saleh. We came into this case way into it and we recognized the difficulties that were present and we -- the three of us worked hard in tandem at times, oftentimes together, towards seeing to it that Mr. Saleh, regardless of difficulties, had the level of representation that this Court demands that he has given all of the difficulties present. And I feel very comfortable, Your Honor, that we have accomplished that.

Your Honor, that concludes my remarks.

And I would like to just, if I can, just adopt those same remarks for the proceeding that is to follow.

And I thank you, Your Honor, for the opportunity to speak on his behalf. And more importantly, I thank you for the opportunity to represent him, because in our system, we have to have lawyers who are prepared to go in even in the most difficult cases and find that part of humanity that exists in people who are charged before this Court. It allows us to maintain the integrity of what we are all seeking to accomplish in courts and I know it is something that I am and my colleagues are proud of.

THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.

I will now hear from the assistant united states

Michele Lucchese, RPA, CRR Officia. Cour. Reporter

17 Proceedings 1 attorney. 2 MS. KOMATIREDDY: Thank you, Your Honor. 3 The most concerning thing about this defendant at 4 the time that he committed the charged offenses and even until 5 this day is that he is a true believer in ISIS and its violent ideology, and its command, its directive to find the infidels 6 7 in whatever way that you can, wherever you are. 8 Counsel has suggested that Mr. Saleh's difficulties 9 are largely a result of solitary confinement that he has 10 experienced during his time at the MDC, but it is important to 11 It is true that Mr. Saleh was put in point out a few things. 12 the SHU shortly after he started his pretrial detention, and 13 that's because of his conduct, his desire to fight against the 14 system, that is the system of what he considers to be the 15 It was a disciplinary infraction on his part, in infidels. 16 particular, an attempt to circumvent the prison's monitoring 17 of jail calls by allowing someone else to use his telephone 18 privileges that resulted in that time --19 THE defendant: He didn't have any money in his 20 account and I --21 THE COURT: Be quiet. Be quiet. Continue, counsel. 22 MS. KOMATIREDDY: Thank you. 23

The problem is that it didn't stop there. Every instant of the defendant being placed in the SHU was a consequence for a rule or a violation on his part. And

24

Proceedings

although counsel appropriately cites various studies and concerns that are expressed by solitary confinement in different incarceratory situations, none of that is specific to this defendant.

Counsel talks about how some suffer hallucinations or paranoia, but this Court has ordered evaluations of this defendant over the years. And those evaluations state that this defendant does not suffer from hallucinations or paranoia.

It is interesting that defense counsel spends a great portion of their sentencing submission seeming to try to explain all of the defendant's conduct. As they say that the only sensible explanation for the entirety of the defendant's conduct in relation to the 2015 indictment, the 2018 indictment, and all institutional misconduct in between and ever since is a result of his -- substantial impairments in the defendant's decisionmaking ability brought about by significant mental health impairments. In other words, the defense asks this Court to assume that all of the defendant's criminal conduct is the result of mental illness. But the law does not support this presumption and the evidence in this case shows otherwise.

It is very clear why the defendant does what he does, because he believes in fighting the infidels. He took ISIS's call to heart and that call was specific.

Proceedings

In March of 2015, an ISIS recruiter told his followers: If you can't make hijra, that is travel to the Middle East, don't sit at home and give up; ignite a bomb, stab a kafir -- that's a disbeliever -- or shoot a politician. If you came here, you would be on the frontline fighting, right? But you couldn't come here. So why not fight the kafir over there. Your jihad is not over just because you got stopped.

Those same sentiments are echoed by this defendant.

In the defendant's own Twitter feed, he posts I'm ready to die for the caliphate. Prison is nothing.

You see, it became clear to this defendant, after he attempted to travel himself, after he sent money in support of ISIS and others traveling to support ISIS, after he did everything he could on the outside, spreading instructions about how to create improvised explosive devices and acquiring explosive --

THE defendant: Molotov cocktails. Molotov cocktails.

THE COURT: Be quiet or we will have to impose conditions that secure you do not speak until the opportunity is accorded to you in a few moments to speak. You will be able to speak to the Court in a few minutes, sir, and to say anything you deem appropriate, as I said earlier, as I'm sure as your distinguished counsel is telling you now.

So we will hear from the Government and then hear from Probation and then, Mr. Saleh, we will hear from you.

As my children would have put it, chill out.

Go ahead, Counsel.

MS. KOMATIREDDY: Yes, Your Honor.

In short, Your Honor, everything we see from this defendant, it is his jihad.

As soon as the law enforcement officers stopped him from hurting others in the outside world, he turned his energies to hurting others while in prison. That became apparent from the very beginning.

At the time of his arrest, he asked the law enforcement officers what took you so long?

During his post-arrest statement, he asked the law enforcement officers to send him to prison, to send him to a black site. It became clear in that conduct when he refused to be fingerprinted during processing, when he refused to speak to a magistrate judge during arraignment, when he initiated a hunger strike shortly after entering the prison, and ever since, when he assaulted correction officers, set fires in prison, hit emergency alarms in order to cause chaos. Every single one of those actions in support of ISIS's directive to fight the infidels.

This is not mental illness; it is ideology. And the most concerning thing is that this defendant continues to hold

	Proceedings 21
1	that ideology. This Court has seen other ISIS supporters and
2	sentenced other ISIS supporters, and has seen how in certain
3	instances, after intervention, an individual can renounce that
4	ideology and turn a corner. But this defendant has done the
5	opposite. He has double-downed and he has found every
6	possible means to fight and continued that fight, continued
7	his jihad.
8	Because this conduct requires retribution,
9	deterrence and incapacitation, the Government requests a
10	guidelines sentence.
11	THE COURT: Thank you, counsel.
12	Does Probation have a statement to make?
13	THE PROBATION OFFICER: No, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Saleh, what, if
15	anything, would you like to say to this Court?
16	MR. RICCO: I'm sorry, Your Honor, he had a question
17	that I answered.
18	THE COURT: Mr. Saleh, what, if anything, would you
19	like to say to the Court? You don't have to. It is up to
20	you.
21	THE defendant: In the name of Allah, the most
22	merciful, the most kind
23	(Defendant speaking foreign language.)
24	THE defendant: Indeed, all praises to Allah. We
25	praise Him and we seek His aid and forgiveness. Whomsoever

	Proceedings 22
1	Allah guides, no one can misguide. And we seek refuge in
2	Allah from the evil of ourselves and our evil deeds.
3	Whomsoever Allah guides, no one can misguide, and whomsoever
4	Allah misguides, no one can guide
5	(Defendant speaking foreign language.)
6	THE defendant: All of you who believe
7	(Defendant speaking foreign language.)
8	THE defendant: Fear Allah, as He should be feared
9	(Defendant speaking foreign language.)
10	THE defendant: And do not die except in a state of
11	Islam submission. All mankind, fear your guardian Lord who
12	created you from one sole and from that sole, Adam, he created
13	its mates, Hawa, Eve. And from them both, he scattered many
14	men and woman
15	(Defendant speaking foreign language.)
16	THE defendant: And fear Allah through whom you
17	demand your mutual rights and do not cut the ties of kinship.
18	Indeed, Allah is ever a watcher over you. Allah says
19	(Defendant speaking foreign language.)
20	THE defendant: All of you who believe, fear Allah
21	and say a word that is right, that is just, that is firm.
22	(Defendant speaking foreign language.)
23	THE defendant: He will correct your affairs and
24	forgive you your sins
25	(Defendant speaking foreign language.)

	Proceedings 23
1	THE defendant: And whoever obeys Allah in His
2	messenger, then indeed He has achieved a great achievement.
3	As to what follows, and, indeed, the best speech is
4	the book of Allah's Al Quran, and the best guidance is the
5	guidance of
6	(Defendant speaking foreign language.)
7	THE defendant: Peace and blessing be upon Him in
8	the words of affairs are those newly invented matters for
9	every newly invented matter is an innovation and every
10	innovation is misguidance in religion and every misguidance
11	leads to the fire.
12	As to what follows, I wanted to respond to a
13	statement and I wanted to recite a chapter of the Koran by the
14	judge a couple years ago when he said that he was agnostic
15	when it came to the affairs of prison, and I didn't want to
16	respond to what happened in prison, but I just want to respond
17	to the word agnostic, and I wanted to recite a chapter so that
18	my family can hear as well
19	(Defendant speaking foreign language.)
20	THE defendant: The most merciful
21	(Defendant speaking foreign language.)
22	THE defendant: He taught the Koran. He created
23	mankind
24	(Defendant speaking foreign language.)
25	THE defendant: He taught how to speak. He taught

```
Proceedings
                                                                  24
    him the language --
1
 2
               (Defendant speaking foreign language.)
              THE defendant: The son and the moon are all
 3
 4
    accounted for --
5
               (Defendant speaking foreign language.)
              THE defendant: And the stars and the planets, they
6
 7
    prostate to Him, and the Heavens he raised --
8
               (Defendant speaking foreign language.)
9
              THE defendant: And he made just the balance --
10
               (Defendant speaking foreign language.)
11
               THE defendant: So do not transgress in the
12
    balance --
13
               (Defendant speaking foreign language.)
14
              THE COURT: Mr. Ricco, would you agree that this
    completes your client's statement to the Court?
15
16
                           I would, Your Honor.
              MR. RICCO:
17
              THE COURT:
                           Thank you, Mr. Saleh.
              THE defendant:
18
                               I wanted to finish up.
19
              THE COURT: You're finished. I thank you.
20
              MS. KOMATIREDDY: Your Honor?
21
              THE COURT:
                           Yes.
22
              MS. KOMATIREDDY: May I just ask that the defendant
23
    be advised should he wish any of his Arabic language remarks
24
    to be considered by the Court that they should be repeated in
25
    English.
```

	Proceedings 25
1	MR. RICCO: Your Honor, we know how to handle this.
2	THE COURT: I'm sorry?
3	MR. RICCO: I'm sorry. We don't need any guidance
4	from the Government as to how to handle this.
5	THE COURT: Speak into the microphone.
6	MR. RICCO: Yes. We don't need the guidance from
7	the Government how to handle this. We will advise the
8	defendant. And we will try our best to get to the court
9	reporter those sections of the Koran that he was referring to.
10	Most of it, Your Honor, is Chapter 55, and we will do our best
11	to make sure that the Court has an accurate record of it.
12	THE COURT: Inshallah.
13	MR. RICCO: Inshallah. Thank you.
14	THE COURT: The Court may have understood a lot more
15	than some people might think the Court understood.
16	All right. Thank you, Mr. Saleh.
17	The Court has this to say:
18	Perfect justice in this case would involve a power
19	that neither I nor any judge nor any human being, for that
20	matter, has in his or her hands. It is challenging and
21	humbling to sit here as the Court and to pass sentence on a
22	fellow human being.
23	This case impacts your family, who are here today in
24	support, and the Court acknowledges them and blesses them for
25	their support throughout. And the Court acknowledges the

efforts that the family made prior to 2015 to prevent many of the actions that occurred, including taking steps to secure the passport to prevent the defendant from leaving the country and perhaps, by taking those steps, saved his life.

I do not want you to think that I have not seen every step that the men and women, family members took to protect Mr. Saleh went unnoticed or unappreciated. You are the reason he is still alive. God has blessed you, your family, and the steps that you have taken to keep him alive and to protect him and all citizens throughout the world, not just in this country, but throughout the world, from the evils of ISIS. You are to be commended for that. You are to be commended for that.

We are all limited human actors. And in my faith division, we are all sinners. I get that. We all get that. And you are to be commended for your steps.

But, ultimately, although this case impacts your family and this case impacts the victims of your crimes and the intended victims of your crimes, ultimately this case is about you. This case is about what you did that brought us here today, which is a day of sadness and a day of tragedy.

We will, of course, have the entirety of your comments, Mr. Saleh, translated and made a part of the record of this proceeding. And you should be comforted in knowing that, and your family should be comforted in knowing that as

well.

I'm going to read the Memorandum and Order in this case which details the history of this case, both the law and the facts, and then we're going to briefly adjourn this proceeding. We will have another court reporter come in and we will do the second proceeding.

On July 24th of 2018, the defendant, Mr. Ali Saleh, pled guilty pursuant to a written plea agreement to two counts of attempting to provide material support to a foreign terrorist organization in violation of Title 18 of the United States Code Section 2339B(a)(1). The Court hereby sentences this defendant and sets forth its reasons for the defendant's sentence using the mandatory rubric of 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a) factors pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(c)(2).

And I want all counsel and all parties present to know that I will be filing this Memorandum and Order in its entirety on ECF at the end of these proceedings today. So feel free to take notes, but you will have the entirety of this Memorandum and Order. But I'm going to read it so that all of the people here today, including the defendant, hear it in realtime.

The legal standard of 18 U.S.C. Section 3553 outlines the procedures for imposing sentence in a criminal case. The starting point and the initial benchmark in evaluating a criminal sentence is the guidelines sentencing

Michele Lucchese, RPA, CRR Officia. Cour. Reporter

range pursuant to *Gall versus United States*, 552 U.S. 38, at page 49, decided in 2007. If and when a district court chooses to impose a sentence outside a Sentencing Guidelines range, the Court shall state in open court the reasons for its imposition of the particular sentence and the specific reason for the imposition of a sentence different from that described in the guidelines. The Court must also state with specificity its reasons for so departing or varying in a statement of reasons form.

The sentencing court's written statements of reasons shall be simple, fact-specific statement explaining why the guideline range did not account for a specific factor or factors under Section 3553(a) pursuant to the decision of my late esteemed dear colleague Jack Weinstein, *United States versus Davis*, 08-CR-0332, 2010 Westlaw 1221709 at star 1 decided here in the Eastern District on March 29 of 2010.

Section 3553(a) provides seven factors for the Court to consider in determining what sentence to impose on a criminal defendant and the Court now addresses each in turn, beginning with the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant.

The first 3553(a) factor requires this Court to evaluate the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant.

The defendant was born on December 18 of 1992 in

Proceedings

Queens, New York. He is one of four children born to the marriage of Mr. Saleh Musa and Ms. Fatimah Musa. The defendant's father owns a grocery store and works as a security guard for a company that delivers money to automatic teller machines. His mother is a homemaker. The defendant has good relations with his parents and they remain supportive of him throughout the incarceration and despite the incarceration of the instant offense and the Court appreciates that support.

In telephonic interviews, the defendant's parents have described him as a good kid and expressed a profound sense of sadness over his legal situation, a sentence that the Court shares. The defendant's siblings are also aware of the instant offense and remain supportive.

The defendant described growing up in a home with basic necessities, free from any instance of abuse or neglect. He graduated from Hillcrest High School in Queens in 2010, attended City College in New York in January 2011 through May 2011, when he was 21 years old, and he attended La Guardia Community College from March of 2013 until June of 2014.

And prior to his incarceration, the defendant was employed as a deli clerk in his father's grocery store and as a cashier at his uncle's restaurant and was otherwise supported by his parents in a nurturing and supportive way.

Between December 2014 and July of 2015, the defendant lived

Michele Lucchese, RPK, CRR Officia. Cour. Reporter

with his uncle in Fort Wayne, Indiana. And prior to his arrest in the case, the defendant lived with his parents in Queens, New York.

The defendant is single, has never been married, has no children.

The defendant is generally in good physical health, other than minor problems, including a vitamin deficiency and low blood pressure. During his incarceration for the instant offense, he has been treated in connection with a hunger strike and has been taken to the hospital for a drug overdose that was deemed accidental and/or unintentional.

The defendant has undergone comprehensive psychological evaluation since his arrest, as we've heard today from his counsel and the Government. The results of these evaluations have been inconclusive in determining the defendant's specific mental health issues. Defense counsel argues the defendant's offense resulted from substantial impairments in Mr. Saleh's decisionmaking ability brought about by significant mental health impairments. That's set forth in the defendant's sentencing memorandum at 8, ECF No. 157, paragraphs 84 through 90. The defendant has declined psychological services while in prison according to the PSR in paragraph 84.

In approximately 2013, the defendant became interested in the conflict in Syria, specifically in ISIS. At

Proceedings

the time of the defendant's offense conduct, ISIS was pursuing the objective of establishing an Islamic state or caliphate based in the Middle East. As stated earlier, ISIS is widely recognized as one of the preeminent threats in the world today, responsible for more deaths than any terrorist organization or extremist group over the past several years. ISIS routinely carried out killings; deliberately targeting civilians; mass executions; persecution of individuals of communities on the basis of their religion, nationality, or ethnicity; kidnaping of civilians; forced displacement of Shia Muslim communities and minorities; killing and maiming children; rape; and other forms of sexual violence. The defendant swore an oath of allegiance to ISIS and decided to travel to the Middle East in support of ISIS.

The defendant espoused his support for ISIS through multiple public online forums. He had at least nine Twitter accounts, as well accounts on Facebook, Kik, and Telegram, and over the course of one year, he posted and reposted hundreds of messages glorifying ISIS, promoting violent jihad, spreading ISIS propaganda, supporting ISIS objectives. During this time, one of the photographs associated with defendant's Twitter account was a photograph known to be an ISIS recruitment billboard in Iraq.

The defendant made efforts to facilitate others in support of ISIS. Through his social media accounts, he held

himself out to be someone who would assist others who wanted to make "hijra," travel, and join ISIS in the Middle East.

Defendant chose Twitter usernames that included hijra_sponsor and sponsormujahid; translated: Travel sponsor and sponsor a fighter. When other ISIS supporters contacted the defendant on Twitter with his assistance to travel to ISIS-controlled territories, he provided them with contact information for ISIS facilitators who could help or redirect them to contact him using encrypted-messaging services.

With respect to his attempts to travel to the Middle East in support of ISIS fighters, the record is replete.

The defendant was arrested after repeatedly attempting to travel to the Middle East to become a foreign fighter for ISIS. He first attempted to join ISIS in August, August 28th of 2014, when he made an airline reservation from New York to Turkey, the country bordering on Syria.

After that failed attempt, the defendant ordered a fire starter knife and folding knife from Amazon, as well a book title, "Messages to the World: Statements of Osama Bin Laden." On twitter, he retweeted, "Do not ask for anyone's advice and do not seek anyone's verdict. Kill the disbeliever whether he is civilian or military," and tweeted, "Get close to the real kuffar and assassinate them."

On October 2014, the defendant communicated with an ISIS supporter in Mali through an online messaging platform

Proceedings

and sent a wire transfer in the amount of \$500 to fund that person's travel to Syria. During the same time period, the defendant communicated with other individuals to facilitate their support of ISIS, including known ISIS supporters in the United Kingdom and Australia.

In July of 2015, the defendant purchased fireworks containing 1,196 grams of low-explosive powder, hid them in a concealed compartment in the trunk of his car and drove them from Indiana towards New York City. On Defendant's phone, law enforcement agents discovered instructions regarding how to create a bomb using explosive powder from fireworks. The fireworks the defendant possessed was sufficient to create multiple soda can grenades analogous to the one depicted in the instructions and in online posts by the defendant. They were also sufficient to create pressure-cooker bombs described in the instructions. As the defendant drove toward New York City with those explosive materials in his trunk, his car broke down and he was forced to have it towed. In addition to the fireworks, law enforcement officers found a tactical knife located inside the car.

In 2015, the defendant rededicated his efforts to join ISIS overseas. He made at least five separate attempts over 10 days to travel to the Middle East to fight ISIS.

On July 24, 2015, he contacted an ISIS facilitator in Lebanon who had instructed followers to contact him on the

Proceedings

encrypted platforms for Kik and Telegram for hijra, travel advice, to IS in Libya only. The defendant then made a same day one-way booking to travel on Qatar Airways from New York JFK to Doha, Qatar, then on to Cairo, Egypt. Notably, Egypt and Libya are bordering countries and it was relatively common at the time for individuals to travel to Egypt to Libya to join ISIS. When the defendant attempted to pay for the flight at the JFK ticket counter, he was declined. Later that evening, the defendant attempted to buy tickets to Egypt at Newark Liberty Internation Airport in Newark, New Jersey, but was also declined.

On July 26th of 2015, the defendant reserved a flight itinerary for a same day one-way departure on Qatar Airways from Philadelphia International to Cairo, Egypt. When the defendant attempted to obtain a boarding pass, he was denied. The next day the defendant went to Indianapolis International Airport in Indiana, and appeared to again inquire into flights. He left the airport without making any reservations.

Finally, on August 2nd of 2015, the defendant went to Amtrak train station in Cleveland, Ohio and attempted to take a train Toronto, Canada, where he intended to fly from Toronto to Yemen. After law enforcement intervention, he did not board the train to Toronto and instead returned to New York City.

Proceedings

On September 17th of 2015, law enforcement agents arrested the defendant at his home. During a search of his home, the agents recovered paper copies of an itinerary and a Turkish visa issued in the defendant's name for his September 2014 attempt to travel and the duffle bag containing flashlights, headlamps, and other survival gear. Agents also recovered a black trunk containing 29 machetes near the defendant's sleeping area. The defendant acknowledged his Miranda rights but was generally uncooperative in his post-arrest interview.

The defendant has been in detention at the MDC since September of 2015. And as detailed in the pre-sentence report, the defendant has been cited on at least 100 separate occasions for committing disciplinary infractions, many of which involved acts of violence.

In October of 2015, the defendant was cited for giving and accepting money without authorization because his personal identification number was used by another inmate to place calls, removing handcuffs from his left hand and slipping out of his waist chain and attempting to conceal the restraints by covering his arms with a blanket and refusing to consent to a visual search.

In November of 2015, the defendant was cited for refusing to consent to a visual search and refusing to appear at his disciplinary hearing; being unsanitary and untidy and

refusing to obey an order for refusing to comment during his disciplinary hearing; being disruptive and barricading his cell window with his mattress in order to obstruct the view of his cell from the staff, disobeying the staff when they asked him to remove the obstruction; and hitting the distress alarm button and jamming the alarm button in the Special Housing Unit, the so-called SHU, which you have heard about today.

In December of 2015, the defendant was cited for multiple instances of refusing to attend his disciplinary hearings and refusing to be searched in the SHU.

In June of 2016, the defendant was cited for failing to stand for a prison count and refusing to obey an order to do so, refusing to obey an order because he was found in a common area with a sweatshirt and a sheet wrapped around him; being in an unauthorized area during a lockdown drill; refusing to remove sheets of paper from his cell window; blocking his cell window and cell slot with paper in order to obstruct the view from staff; refusing to remove the paper when ordered to do so, not complying when asked to submit to restraints; and activating the SHU distress alarm multiple times when there was, in fact, no emergency.

On one occasion BOP staff found the defendant's food slot opened. As the BOP officer began to secure the food slot, the defendant charged the food slot from the back of his cell which resulted in the bar smashing into the officer's

knee multiple times. When the defendant was ordered to stop movement, he refused to do so. Several months later, as BOP staff were attempting to photograph the cell, the defendant kicked the BOP officer in his mid-section, which resulted in redness and swelling of his torso.

In July and August of 2016, the defendant was cited for refusing to attend his disciplinary hearing multiple times; covering his cell window in SHU, refusing to remove the covering and jamming the food slot with a plastic bag; covering his cell window in the SHU again; activating the duress alarm repeatedly and kicking a BOP officer in the upper torso during a pat-down search.

In September of 2016, the defendant was cited for covering his cell window in the SHU; refusing to attend disciplinary hearings multiple times; breaking food slots multiple times; refusing to stop pulling on a light fixture while standing on the top bunk and attempting to kick BOP officers when they removed him and placed him against the wall; destroying property valued at \$100 or less for ripping the plastic cover of his mattress.

In October 2016, the defendant was cited for fighting with another inmate, refusing to remove a covering from his cell window; refusing to attend a disciplinary hearing for destroying the light fixture in his room and removing a metal desk from the wall in his SHU.

Additionally, the defendant was cited for banging on his cell window with a small stool seat that he had broken off from his cell table, damaging the food port block on his cell door and shattering the glass window. The defendant, still holding the stool seat, told officers "I'm going to hit whoever comes in here with this." He continued to be combative and threatened to kick officials as they tried to subdue him in the MDC.

In December of 2016 and January 2017, the defendant was cited for refusing to remove paper covers from his cell windows in the SHU multiple times; refusing to attend disciplinary hearing multiple times, possessing a dangerous weapon, i.e., a broken piece of his plastic food tray in his hand; placing of his arm inside the food slot at the SHU and fighting with another person.

In April of 2017, the defendant was cited for attempting to grab the duty belt of the officer through a food slot in his Special Housing Unit cell; refusing to be placed in restraints multiple times and kicking an officer in the thigh and hitting him in the back of his head during a routine pat-down search.

In June and August of 2017, the defendant was cited for assaulting someone without serious injury multiple times; destroying property valued at over \$100 multiple times; refusing to obey an order, possessing a dangerous weapon;

fighting with another person.

In September and October of 2017, the defendant was cited for refusing to obey on order; assault multiple times with and without serious injury, interfering with taking count; setting a fire and possessing a dangerous weapon.

In November 2017, the defendant was cited for destroying property and refusing to appear for his disciplinary hearing. The defendant was also cited for possession of a dangerous weapon, destroying Government property, tampering with security devices, covering his cell window in the Special Housing Unit. BOP staff also observed him banging and kicking on the door repeatedly. When he uncovered the window, he was in possession of a large metal object from the light fixture which he used to bang on the door. The defendant was thereafter placed in restraints and removed from his cell. Upon inspection of his cell, BOP security officers observed that there were screws from light fixture and the light bulb removed and his desk attached to the wall was damaged.

In December 2017 and January 2018, defendant was cited for interfering with taking count; refusing to appear at disciplinary hearings; destroying property; and assaulting someone without serious injury.

In March of 2018, the defendant was cited for assault without serious injury multiple times. On one

Proceedings

occasion, the defendant through an unknown substance through an open food slot in the Special Housing Unit. He thereafter refused to close the food slot stating "I want my sheet, I want my sheet." On another occasion staff observed the defendant attempting to destroy the ceiling tiles. Staff attempted to remove the defendant to another cell. He became combative, struck an officer in the head and torso with his closed fist. He then refused to appear at his disciplinary hearing. Defendant was also cited for refusing a drug/alcohol test.

On April 24, 2018, the defendant was cited for possessing a dangerous weapon and assault without serious injury. According to the BOP disciplinary hearing report, an inmate was observed with superficial lacerations on the left forearm that were consistent with being cut with a sharp object. While investigating this incident, BOP staff discovered the defendant had recently gone through a metal detector, which revealed a two-inch piece of aluminum metal located on his person, and it was determined that he used this metal object to assault the other inmate. The defendant then refused to appear at the disciplinary hearing.

On July 13, 2018, the defendant was cited for possessing a dangerous weapon and assaulting a BOP officer with a knife. This was the incident for which the defendant was indicted in docket 18-CR-468, which we will consider

immediately after this proceeding.

In August, October, and November of 2018, the defendant was cited for refusing to obey orders; destroying property, and possessing a dangerous weapon.

In March and April of 2019, the defendant was cited for interfering with security devices, destroying property and possessing a dangerous weapon.

In May of 2019, the defendant was cited for destroying property valued at \$100 or less when he bent his handcuff and took it off.

In February, March, and May of 2020, the defendant was cited for possessing a dangerous weapon.

In September, October, November, and December 2020, defendant was cited for destroying property on multiple occasions; possessing a dangerous weapon; assaulting without serious injury; setting a fire; refusing to obey on order, and interfering with taking count of inmates.

In January through May of this year, 2021, the defendant has been cited for assaulting someone without serious injury on multiple occasions; refusing to obey orders multiple times; possessing dangerous weapon; interfering with security devices on many occasions; refusing to obey orders, and destroying property over \$100 in value.

The second 3553(a) factor addresses the Court to consider the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the

seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense; to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct; to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant; and to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner.

The Court's sentence recognizes the seriousness of the defendant's offenses and punishes the defendant accordingly. It seeks to deter the defendant from further criminal activity, from disregarding United States law, and from engaging in illicit activity.

The third 3553(a) factor requires the Court to consider the kinds of sentence available with respect to this defendant pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a)(3).

The defendant pled guilty, pursuant to the plea agreement, to Counts Two and Three of the superseding indictment, charging the defendant with attempt to provide material support to a foreign terrorist organization violating 18 U.S.C. Section 2339B(a)(1).

For Count Two, the defendant faces a statutory maximum imprisonment term of 15 years pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2339B(a)(1).

For Count Three, the defendant faces the statutory maximum prison term of 20 years pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 2339B(a)(1)(2015). On both Counts Two and Three, defendant

Proceedings

faces a statutory maximum of life imprisonment, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 3583(j), per count to be served concurrently; a fine of up \$250,000 pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 3571(b), per count; and a mandatory special assessment of \$100 pursuant to 18 U.S.C. Section 3013, per count.

The fourth 3553(a) factor requires the Court to discuss the kinds of sentence and the sentencing range established for the applicable category of offense committed by the defendant as set forth in the guidelines.

Now, the parties disagree, as I previously noted, as to whether the Defendant's total offense level in this case comes to the competing counts.

One side says Docket Number 15-CR-517 should be grouped with a total offense level in Docket Number 18-CR-468. While the instant case concerns the Defendant's attempt to join to support ISIS, Docket Number 18-CR-468 concerns his assault of prison guard using a contraband knife. Accordingly, the Court will, as proposed by the Government, treat each case as a separate proceeding and sentence the defendant separately in each case.

Despite Probation's grouping of the total offense level in the pre-sentence investigation report and defense counsel's request to consolidate the proceedings, as I have stated, the Government notes that they do not have and they do not consent to consolidate the proceedings. And I think the

record is clearer by doing them seriatim, as I've indicated earlier and which I'm doing.

The purpose of the grouping rule as set forth in Part 3D in the sentencing guidelines is to prevent multiple punishments for substantially identical conduct. This is not the case here. Accordingly, the Court proceeds to sentence the defendant separately under each indictment.

The applicable guideline for a violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 2339B(a)(1) is USSG Section 2M5.3(a), which all parties agree provides a base offense level of 26. The parties also agree that because the defendant transported 1,196 grams of explosive powder in a concealed compartment in the trunk of his car during the instant offense, two levels are added.

The parties also agree that because the offense is a felony that involved or was intended to promote a federal crime of terrorism, the offense level is increased by 12.

Further, the Government and defense counsel agree that the defendant's acceptance of responsibility results in a three-level reduction. Probation, however, groups the offenses in this case and 18-CR-468. They do not credit the defendant with this reduction because after his arrest, he has continued to commit crimes and infractions in prison under their view. Therefore, the defendant's total offense level according to the Government and the defense is 37. The

Michele Lucchese, RPK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

defendant's total offense level according to Probation would be 40.

The parties agree the defendant has a Criminal History Category of six. Because the defendant has, as I previously stated, no known prior criminal conviction, his criminal history category score is zero, which generally establishes a Criminal History Category of One. However, because the instant offense is a felony that involves or was intended to promote a federal crime of terrorism, the defendant's criminal history category is automatically a category six, pursuant to USSG Section 3A1.4(b).

A total offense level of 37 or 40, with a Criminal History Category of six, yields a guidelines imprisonment range of 360 months to life. However, because of the statutory maximum sentence, the effective Guidelines range is 360 to 420 months of imprisonment. Additionally, the Guidelines range further suggests a term of supervised release of one year to life; a fine of between 50,000 and \$500,000, and notes the defendant is ineligible for Probation.

The U.S. Probation Department recommends a sentence of 15 years of custody on Count Two, 20 years of custody on Count Three to run consecutively; 15 years of supervised release to run concurrently on each count, and the special conditions outlined in their sentencing recommendation.

The Government recommends a guidelines sentencing

Proceedings

range of between 360 and 420 months and notes the defendant consented to the imposition of a term of lifetime supervised release in the plea agreement.

Defense counsel has not asked the Court for a specific sentence, as I noted earlier, but instead asks for a sentence of not more than 300 months on both this indictment and the indictment brought under 18-CR-468.

The Fifth 3553 factor requires this Court to evaluate any pertinent policy statement issued by the Sentencing Commission. The Sentencing Commission outlines grounds for departures from a Guidelines sentence in some circumstances. Defense counsel argues a downward departure from the Guidelines is warranted in this case for three reasons: First, Mr. Saleh has significant mental health issues, which would be better served by psychiatric treatment rather than prolonged incarceration or isolation.

Second, Mr. Saleh's condition and his conduct have been far from stellar, they acknowledge, but they state it is likely the result of detaining the defendant, who has significant mental health issues, in their view, in the MDC Special Housing Unit, the SHU, often in isolation, as we've heard for thousands of days.

And third, while the intent of Mr. Saleh's crimes, they acknowledge, was odorous, his ability to succeed in completing them was disorganized, confused, and disconcerted

Michele Lucchese, RPA, CRR Officia. Cour. Reporter

because of his mental situation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, the defendant further argues that 300 months or 25 years is a lengthy and substantial sentence and that individuals charged with gang and organized crime-related murders, including MS-13, the Bloods, the Crips, the Mafia, often receives sentences in this District in the 20- to 25-year range, even when multiple murders are proven beyond a reasonable doubt. The defense argues that the defendant's institutional conduct reflect the conclusion that Mr. Saleh possesses a Schizotypal Personality Disorder. That is the statement of Dr. Xenakis, manifested by bizarre and odd thinking, unusual and idiosyncratic interpretations of events and situations, and episodic and overwhelming distress and Defense counsel claims this condition was extended dysphoria. and exacerbated by the defendant's placement in solitary confinement.

Additionally, defense counsel argues the defendant has been exposed to absolutely abhorrent conditions of confinement during the past six years, including multiple blackouts, flooding, mold in his cell, lack of heat, and most recently, disruption of food services and deprivation of basic sanitary conditions, such as cleaning supplies to the cells despite COVID 19 raging alarmingly through the jails.

Defense counsel does not dispute the disciplinary struggles Mr. Saleh has had while detained at the MDC, but

Michele Lucchese, RPK, CRR Officia. Cour. Reporter

Proceedings

states the treatment he has received cannot be justified by anything he is alleged to have done. Moreover, defense counsel calls attention to a recent incident in which the defendant, upset at his prayer book being dropped, kicked the officer standing behind him, an officer with whom defendant had a history of negative verbal interactions.

Defense counsel states that the officer responded by throwing Mr. Saleh against the metal door to his cell so hard that he had to be transported to an outside hospital. Mr. Saleh's injury included two puncture wounds to the skull, measuring approximately one-half centimeter to one centimeter, and substantial swelling of his face that impacted his ability to eat and to speak. In light of these circumstances, defense counsel argues a sentence of no more than 300 months imprisonment in this proceeding should be imposed and the proceeding in 18-CR-468 would be sufficient but not greater than that to achieve the goals set forth in 18 U.S.C. 3553(a).

In contrast, Probation provides that, and seeks, an upward departure may be necessary because of the defendant's multiple violent assaults at the MDC and against its officers while in custody, which he was not charged with in Docket Number 18-CR-468. Probation states that his behavior constitutes additional criminal activity for which the defendant is not held accountable in the advisory guidelines calculation, and may warrant an upward departure pursuant to

USSG Section 5K2.21.

Moreover, Probation notes that because of the grouping rules, the additional conviction on the assault charges resulted in no charge from the original advisory guideline range. As a result, this range may not provide ample and appropriate additional punishment for the assault conduct. The Court may consider this as a basis for departure if it wishes to do so pursuant to the background in the commentary of USSG Section 3D1.4. Because the Court is conducting separate sentencings, this factor is not relevant.

Next is the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities. This is the sixth 3553(a) factor requiring the Court to consider the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who are found guilty of similar conduct, 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a)(6). For the reasons stated in this Memoranda and Order and considering the other six 3553(a) factors, the Court's sentence in this case avoids unwarranted sentence disparities.

The final and seventh 3553(a) factor requires this Court to touch upon the need to provide restitution to any victims of the offense. In the Court's view, this factor 18 U.S.C. 3557(a)(7), is not relevant to this case.

Therefore, given the nature of the offense and the circumstances, the Court imposes a sentence of 360 months of incarceration, which is the bottom of the Guidelines range,

and lifetime supervised release, which was agreed to in the plea agreement, and find that this is sufficient but not greater than that necessary to comply with the purposes set forth in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a).

Ordinarily, there would be a fine imposed of between 5,000 and 500,000. It's optional.

Probation reports the defendant appears unable to pay such a fine. The Court agrees. So no fine is being imposed.

The defendant shall pay the mandatory assessment of \$100 per count, which I am required to impose in all cases. The Court hereby adopts the factual findings of the pre-sentence investigation report and its addenda, barring any errors contained therein and to the extent they are not inconsistent with the Court's sentencing.

The Court also adopts the special conditions recommended by the Probation Department. The Court will now read those special conditions out loud into the record so there is no confusion about what they are.

The defendant shall participate in an education or vocational training program as selected by the Probation Department.

The defendant shall participate in a mental health treatment program as approved by the Probation Department.

The defendant shall contribute to the cost of such services

Proceedings

rendered and/or any psychotropic medications prescribed to the degree he is reasonably able to do so and shall cooperate in securing any applicable third-party payment. The defendant shall disclose all financial information and documents to the Probation Department and assess his ability to pay.

The defendant shall comply with the medication regime prescribed by a licensed psychiatrist approved by the Probation Department. The defendant shall contribute to the cost of such services rendered and any psychotropic medications prescribed by a co-payment or full payment in an amount to be determined by the Probation Department based upon the defendant's ability to pay and/or the availability of third-party payment.

The defendant shall not associate in person, through mail, electronic mail, the internet, social media, telephone, or any other means with any individual with an affiliation to any organized crime groups, gangs or any other criminal enterprise; nor shall the defendant frequent any establishment, or other locale where these groups may meet pursuant, but not limited to, a prohibition list provided by the Probation Department.

The defendant shall participate in a polygraph examination to obtain information necessary for risk management and correctional treatment.

The defendant shall cooperate with the United States

Probation Department's computer and internet monitoring program. Cooperation shall include, but not be limited to, identifying computer systems, internet capable devices, and/or similar electronic devices the defendant has access to, and allowing the installation of monitoring software/hardware on said devices, at the defendant's expense. The defendant may be limited to possessing only one personal internet capable device to facilitate the Probation Department's ability to effectively monitor his internet-related activities.

The defendant shall also permit random examinations of said computer systems, internet capable devices, and similar electronic devices, and related computer peripherals, including CD's under his control.

The defendant shall report to the Probation

Department any and all electronic communications service
accounts as defined in 18 U.S.C. 2510(15) used for user
communications, dissemination and/or storage of digital media
files, i.e., audio, video images. This includes, but is not
limited to, e-mail accounts, social media accounts, and cloud
storage accounts. The defendant shall provide each account
identifier and password and shall report the creation of new
accounts, changes in identifiers and/or passwords, transfer,
suspension and/or deletion of any account within five days of
such action. Failure to provide accurate account information
may be grounds for revocation of release. The defendant shall

Proceedings

permit the Probation Department to access and search any accounts using the defendant's credentials pursuant to this condition only when reasonable suspicion exists that the defendant has violated a condition of his supervised release and that the accounts to be searched contain evidence of this violation. Failure to submit to such search may be grounds for revocation of release.

A search condition: The defendant shall submit his person, property, house, residence, vehicle, papers, computers, as defined in 18 U.S.C. Section 1030 (e)(1), other electronic communications or data storage devices or media, or office, to a search condition by a United States Probation Officer. Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation of release. The defendant shall warn any other occupant that the premises may be subjected to searches pursuant to this condition. An officer may conduct a search pursuant to this condition only when reasonable suspicion exists that the defendant has violated a condition of his supervision and that the areas to be searched contain evidence of this violation. Any search must be conducted at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner.

Now, is there anything else that either counsel would like to discuss or any charges that need to be dismissed, beginning with the Government, Probation, and then we will hear from defense counsel?

	Proceedings 54
1	MS. KOMATIREDDY: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
2	I apologize. Your Honor imposed a sentence of 360
3	months, but I missed the allocution of that sentence as to
4	each of Counts Two and Three.
5	THE COURT: What are you asking, Counsel?
6	MS. KOMATIREDDY: What is the sentence as to each
7	count, Your Honor?
8	THE COURT: What do you recommend, counsel?
9	MS. KOMATIREDDY: Your Honor, I would recommend 15
10	years as to Count Two and 15 years as to Count Three to run
11	consecutively.
12	THE COURT: So ordered.
13	MS. KOMATIREDDY: Thank you.
14	And, otherwise, the Government moves to dismiss the
15	remaining count of the superseding indictment, as well we move
16	to dismiss the underlying indictment in this case.
17	THE COURT: Any objection?
18	MR. RICCO: No, sir.
19	THE COURT: The motion is granted.
20	Anything else from the Government?
21	MS. KOMATIREDDY: I'm sorry, may I just confer with
22	counsel?
23	THE COURT: You may.
24	MS. KOMATIREDDY: Lastly, Your Honor, I believe a
25	\$200 special assessment applies.

	Proceedings 55
1	THE COURT: As I said, \$100 per count. There are
2	two counts. That comes to \$200 under my high math. That is
3	about as high I can go with the math.
4	Do you agree with that?
5	MS. KOMATIREDDY: I do. My rudimentary math
6	concurs, Your Honor.
7	THE COURT: Okay. Anything else from the
8	Government?
9	MS. KOMATIREDDY: No, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: Anything else from Probation?
11	THE PROBATION OFFICER: No, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Let me hear from defense counsel.
13	MR. RICCO: Your Honor, nothing further. A very
14	thorough sentencing proceeding.
15	I would ask
16	THE COURT: I appreciate that. I'm going to submit,
17	as I said, after we finish this proceeding and we adjourn to
18	the next proceeding, at the end of the day, I will put that
19	Memorandum and Order on ECF so that you have it in its
20	entirety. It is obviously read for the benefit of the
21	defendant, the public, the prosecution, defense, and everyone
22	here to know the details of what goes into this sentence. And
23	you will have that Memorandum and Order to be available to
24	everyone by the end of the day, as I stated. So that will be
25	clear. I think it is important and in basic fairness to

Proceedings	56
-------------	----

everyone that you see it and see the analysis.

MR. RICCO: I agree, Your Honor.

And the other thing I would request, and it is just a request, that the Court recommend in the judgment of the Bureau of Prisons, if it is possible, For the defendant to be able to serve his sentence in the Metropolitan area.

It's a very long sentence, Your Honor. I've seen the impact of long-term incarcerations on defendants who are separated from their family. Your Honor recognizes that there is a strong relationship here. And if the Bureau of Prisons can accommodate it for him to be housed near the Metropolitan area, if possible.

THE COURT: Any objection to that request?

MS. KOMATIREDDY: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm going to put that in the order of judgement, and I'm going to make that a very strong request to the BOP. I think as counsel knows and as the public knows, federal judges do not have power over the BOP, but we are certainly going to make the recommendation.

I will note that last evening, in an unrelated matter, the fact that the Federal Defenders and the U.S. Attorney and the BOP, in and unrelated case, having nothing do with this case, were directed by this Court to inspect a particular situation with a particular defendant, and they have actually now issued to my Chief Judge and the Chief

Magistrate Judge a report dealing with their findings.

So, as I said, I have to stay in my lane as a judge, and I do this on a case-by-case basis. But Federal Defenders, the BOP, and the U.S. Attorney's Office are moving diligently to try to address some of these conditions that everyone is aware of.

I have said before and I will say it again and then we will take -- we are going to have a different court reporter come in for the next proceeding, because she has been very kind to stay here and the other court reporter is in the wings to come in for the next proceeding. We judge our society by how we treat those in our custody. And I have said this before, and I will say it again, no one is to be treated disrespectfully in our system. I will not tolerate it as a United States District Court Judge.

People ought to be treated respectfully in terms of their person and in terms of their faith. Everything I can do I do to try to ensure that. I can't run the BOP. I can't even make our elevators always work here. But I can do this. I can say it again and again and again. I've said it to my judicial colleagues. I've said it to the Federal Defenders. I've said it to the private bar. I have said it to the U.S. attorneys.

This is real life. As may pastor says, this is not a dress rehearsal; this is real life.

Michele Lucchese, RPK, CRR Officia, Cour, Reporter

_				
Pi	roce	edi	nc	ıs

I am not going to sit here and pretend that these horrific conditions do not have an impact on everyone in the system: The defendants, the guards, the marshals, the lawyers, all of us.

This is our judicial system. We have to make it better. That requires better behavior from the defendants and the marshals and the CSO's, and the prosecutors and defense counsel. Everyone. We are in this together. This is why I took this job. This is why we invest this power and this responsibility in Probation and Pretrial. This is what we do.

So we're now going to take a very brief break to change court reporters and we are going to proceed to the next proceeding. I am going to ask counsel if you can avoid leaving -- to avoid leaving while we get this done.

MS. KOMATIREDDY: Your Honor, before we adjourn this proceeding -- I apologize. I should have raised this earlier -- if the Court could please advise the defendant that he has a right to appeal.

THE COURT: The defendant has a right to appeal.

MR. RICCO: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MS. KOMATIREDDY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else from Probation?

THE PROBATION OFFICER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything else from defense counsel?

i			
	Proceedings 59		
1	MR. RICCO: No, sir. Thank you. We are going to		
2	adjourn this proceeding. We're going to move in the new court		
3	reporter. We are going to proceed right to the next		
4	proceeding as I said we would.		
5	MR. RICCO: Can the defendant have a couple of		
6	minutes' break?		
7	THE COURT: A comfort break. Is that acceptable to		
8	everyone, including the marshals?		
9	U.S. MARSHAL: Yes, sir.		
10	THE COURT: Why don't you do that. We will take a		
11	10-minute comfort break. I do mean men minutes. Everyone		
12	behave.		
13	(Matter adjourned.)		
14			
15	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.		
16	record or proceedings in the above-entriced matter.		
17	/s/ Michele D. Lucchese December 20, 2021		
18	Michele D. Lucchese DATE		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			